

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

<b>JACQUELINE E. WADE</b>	)	<b>CONSOLIDATED FOR DISCOVERY</b>
	)	<b>AND PRE-TRIAL MATTERS</b>
<b>v.</b>	)	
	)	<b>Civil Action No. 3:05-0076</b>
<b>AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY</b>	)	
	)	
<b>NANCY J. DAWSON</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>Civil Action No. 3:05-0097</b>
	)	
<b>AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY</b>	)	
	)	
<b>MARY M. WARNER</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>Civil Action No. 3:05-0229</b>
	)	
<b>AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY</b>	)	
	)	
<b>CHERYL D. GARRETT</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>Civil Action No. 3:04-1150</b>
	)	
<b>AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY</b>	)	<b>JUDGE ECHOLS/KNOWLES</b>


**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Court held a Case Management Conference in these cases on May 1, 2007. At that time, the Court discussed with counsel for Ms. Garrett, and with each of the pro se Plaintiffs, the question of whether they intended to sue any entity other than Austin Peay State University. This question arose because each of the Amended Complaints filed in these actions list as Defendants “Austin Peay State University, Carlos A. Gonzalez, James K. Vines, and Robert C. Watson.” Each of the Amended Complaints, however, contains substantive allegations only against Defendant Austin Peay State University.

Counsel for Ms. Garrett advised the Court that Ms. Garrett intends to sue only Austin Peay State University. Each of the pro se Plaintiffs advised the Court that she also intends to sue only Austin Peay State University.

For the foregoing reasons, the undersigned recommends that any claims that may have been asserted by Plaintiffs in these consolidated cases against Defendants Carlos A. Gonzalez, James K. Vines, and/or Robert C. Watson be DISMISSED.

Under Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, any party has ten (10) days from receipt of this Report and Recommendation in which to file any written objections to this Recommendation with the District Court. Any party opposing said objections shall have ten (10) days from receipt of any objections filed in this Report in which to file any response to said objections. Failure to file specific objections within ten (10) days of receipt of this Report and Recommendation can constitute a waiver of further appeal of this Recommendation. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 106 S.Ct. 466, 88 L.Ed. 2d 435 (1985), *reh'g denied*, 474 U.S. 1111 (1986).

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
E. Clifton Knowles  
United States Magistrate Judge